

**From:** KERNLHANDY@aol.com@inetgw  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/27/02 3:36pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Antitrust Case

Renata B. Hesse  
Antitrust Division  
US Dept of Justice  
601 D St NW  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D. C. 20530-0001

Dear Ms Hesse,

I am deeply disturbed that the Department of Justice (DOJ) has moved to settle with Microsoft (MS) in a manner that leaves consumers and professionals subjugated to dictatorial business practices. I have a quarter century of experience in logistics and as a marketing/communications consultant. In these roles, I've observed how monopolistic MS information technology (IT) inhibits productivity. As a proposal developer working on numerous bids with IT companies for commercial and government contracts, I hear frequent complaints from clients and co-workers about the limitations of MS systems and software and their lack of compatibility and interoperability. The well-documented MS shortcomings are costly and prevent hardware and software competition that could speed innovations and IT accessibility to more consumers around the world.

During my career on active duty and in the reserves with the U. S. Air Force our government passed competition legislation to resolve problem problems such as the \$600 hammer and \$1000 aircraft toilet seat that gained such media notoriety in the 1980s. Similarly, any resolution of the MS case that does not maximize competition and consumer choice is not in the best public interest.

At it's most basic level, any resolution of the MS anti-trust case must provide complete information needed for software developers to:

1. Write an affordable and complete Windows Application Environment so Windows applications run on other operating systems without modification;
2. Create products that exchange files, data, and services with any MS product;
3. Replace components in Windows, Office, and Internet Explorer with superior or special purpose components; and
4. Modify MS software to run properly on computers with different microprocessors.

Without these settlement provisions, consumers working with the 70,000 MS Windows applications will continue to face unnecessary costs, limited choices, operational complexity, and reliability problems.

Enforcement provisions in the proposed settlement are also inadequate and virtually assure the monopolistic MS grip will continue to stifle competition, creativity, and cost-effectiveness. Since the Tunney Act allows for public proceedings, the DOJ should announce such sessions at the earliest opportunity to allow consumers to show that an adequate settlement must encompass much more than the current proposition.

Sincerely,

Redmond H. Handy  
President, Government and Business Consulting  
1400 16th St NW  
Suite 330  
Washington, D. C. 20036  
202-462-8800